

## DRAFT MINUTES

Child Support Schedule Workgroup  
Meeting of June 25, 2011  
North Seattle Community College, Room C1151

Attendees: *David Stillman, Kathleen Schmidt, Janet Skreen, Kevin Callaghan, Andrew McDirmid, James Cox, Kathy Lynn, Angela Gerbracht, Timothy Eastman, the Honorable Ed Pesik, Jr.*

DCS Staff: *Ellen Nolan, George Smylie, June Johnson, Nancy Koptur*

Guests: *Pat Lessard*

### **I. Introductions.**

**II. Agenda reviewed.** The agenda was reviewed and approved.

**III. The May 20, 2011 minutes were reviewed and approved.**

**IV. Members were asked to send any follow up questions from the June 24, 2011 phone conference to Ellen Nolan, to forward to Dr. Betson or Mary Hammerly.**

**V. The Children from Other Relationships Committee gave a report.** Ed Pesik presented the subcommittee's written report dated June 25, 2011, which was distributed. Some of the questions for the subcommittee include:

- How does the group think the obligee's other children affect the transfer payment, since the obligee really has no transfer payment? What is the practical effect?
- How would the fact of another parent in the household affect child support?
- Comment was made that they would like to see a change in how the worksheets are completed – especially page 4 – additional factors, to put in actual numbers instead of “tics”.
- Would like to see a requirement for people to complete the assets and debts sections of the worksheets.

**VI. The Postsecondary Education Subcommittee gave a report.** Tim Eastman presented the subcommittee's written report dated 6/25/2011, which was distributed. Some of the questions for the subcommittee include:

- If postsecondary support is suspended for some of the bases stated in the subcommittee's report, will it be retroactive?
- If it is suspended a second time, should it be re-started?
- How many times would it be allowed to stop and start?
- There was a question on why you would deduct a non-obligated person's contribution to post-secondary education – such as a step-parent or grandparent, since they could withdraw their support at any time without a legal obligation to provide the support.
- There was a question on how GET or Section 529 account or other pre-paid college accounts work if a child fails or doesn't attend school.
- If a child is supposed to contribute to the support, what happens if financial aid availability or grants change?
- There was a concern about drawing a “bright line”.

- Some members wanted the subcommittee to take into consideration situations of the child attending school, such as catastrophic illness, car accidents, parental death, and incidents beyond the student's control.
- There was a comment that financial aid may be dependent on circumstances beyond a student's control, such as a professor failing to turn in grades on time.
- Should a dependent child have a support obligation established against that child?
- Should the court apportion some equitable amount between the parents and the child?
- Should the child have some responsibility for postsecondary educational costs?
- Are there ever times where it might be appropriate to pay the postsecondary costs to one or the other parents and not to the child?
- Should termination of support always be determined by the courts and not by the parents upon the meeting of some conditions?

**VII. The Economic Table Subcommittee gave a report.** Jim Cox presented the subcommittee's written report, dated June 22, 2011, which was distributed. Some of the questions for the subcommittee include:

- Note: Kathleen Schmidt sent the subcommittee members a copy of an early Commission report done by Dan Radin. DCS staff will obtain the report and distribute it to the rest of the Workgroup and post the report.
- Does the subcommittee believe the values in the table need to be changed?
- Can the subcommittee get Dr. Betson's reports from Oregon and California?
- If the table is collapsed to one column, how should it be collapsed? The PSI study seems to suggest that the lower age category may be too low.
- One suggestion from a member was to discontinue Category A, continue Category B, but wonders if applying the standards used in the Oregon and California Rothbarth updated method might produce something slightly different?
- Would the subcommittee recommend having Dr. Betson apply his new data, using our assumptions, to our table with one column?
- Jim offered to contact Minnesota and see about what the USDA model might look like as well.
- Could the subcommittee also run some calculations –sample worksheets – from other states at the lower end of the table?

**VIII. The Residential Credit Subcommittee gave a report.** Andrew McDirmid presented the subcommittee's written report dated June 20, 2011, which was distributed. Some of the consensus that the subcommittee was able to reach included that there should be a formula, and that the compromise was that there should be 25% residential time before the residential credit applies. The subcommittee also agrees that the credit should not be applied if a parent is exercising visitation for a period of six months. After six months of non-visitation, the other parent may seek a modification or adjustment of the credit. No matter which formula the workgroup ultimately recommends, there should be some discretion left for the courts.

- Recommendation is to use a cross credit multiplier of .25.
  - Question from the Workgroup – does this make sense to use this as a cross credit when it reduces the custodial parent’s child support by more than half when the noncustodial parent has the child 45% of the time?
  - Should there be a cap on the credit?
  - Should the cross credit be higher?
  - Can the subcommittee go back and run other cross credit numbers to avoid the situation where the custodial parent’s support is reduced by more than 50%?
  - Can the subcommittee make a recommendation when visitation has not been exercised, what would the factors be to not allow or to remove the existing credit, and what would that process look like? Would it be a court process? Or, could you develop an administrative process?
  - Will there still be a definition of “substantial time”?
- IX.** The group discussed the July 23, 2011 meeting. The Workgroup also discussed the revised schedule for the remainder of the workgroup meetings. There will be two meetings in August, where the report will be drafted. The final meeting will be September 9, 2011, to finalize the report. The last subcommittee meetings will be held in July.
- X.** The regular meeting was adjourned.

## DRAFT MINUTES

Child Support Schedule Workgroup Public Forum  
Meeting of June 25, 2011  
North Seattle Community College, Room LB1142

*Attendees: David Stillman, Kathleen Schmidt, Janet Skreen, Kevin Callaghan, Andrew McDirmid, James Cox, Kathy Lynn, Angela Gerbracht, Timothy Eastman, the Honorable Ed Pesik, Jr.*

*DCS Staff: Ellen Nolan, George Smylie, June Johnson, Adolfo Capestany, John Blankenfeld, Tom Atkinson, Sharon Redmond, Doug Cheney*

*Guests: Cary Whitton, Pat Lessard, Kevin Lin, Evelyn Burley, Greg Howe, Carol Van Arnam, T.J. Riordan*

- I. Introductions.** David Stillman introduced the members of the workgroup.
- II. The Subcommittee Leaders gave a brief presentation.** Each of the leaders of the subcommittees, Tim Eastman, Ed Pesik, Andrew McDirmid and Jim Cox, gave a brief overview of the work of the subcommittees.
- III. Members of the public were invited to address the workgroup.** David Stillman invited all members of the public that were present to address the workgroup. Many of the members of the public did address the workgroup.
- IV. The meeting was adjourned.**